KEY:
Closed:
New:

SR 167 / 8th St E Vic to S 277th St Vic - Southbound HOT Lane Project
RFP Questions and Answers #3 - October 28, 2014

Question	RFP Reference	Question	Date Received	Response
1	ITP - 2.1 & 2.2	Section 2.1 of the ITP requires an organizational chart that illustrates key components, relationships and reporting structure and Section 2.2 of the ITP requires an org chart that illustrates the QA and QC organizations. Can one org chart be included to accomplish both objectives? The org chart would be included in Section 2.1 and Section 2.2 would refer to it.	9/9/2014	Yes.
2	Appendix A2	In reviewing the conceptual design alignment and profiles for ramps, we have found some gores that require a steep cross slope (10%) when using the conceptual ramp profile and mainline widening. We have not found any specific limits for gore cross slopes in the RFP or reference documents. Per Design Manual 1230.04(3), a shoulder may be increased to a 6% cross slope, and the maximum difference in slopes between the lane and shoulder is 8%. Is it the intent that gores can follow this shoulder cross slope if justified? Or is the intent to allow steeper or flatter gore cross slopes?	9/29/2014	Yes, the cross slopes can follow the shoulder cross slope requirements.
3	2.17.1; line 19	Should this line read: "Uninterrupted Power Supply system (UPS), Signal System #3 only"?	9/29/2014	Yes. WSDOT will prepare an addendum to address this issue.
4	2.17.3.9	At the 8th St. E./West Valley Hwy. and 8th St. E./SB ramps intersections, visibility limiting signal heads will be required due to the close proximity of the two intersections. What standard does Olympic Region use in these cases (i.e., programmable, louvered)?	9/29/2014	Section 2.17.4.1 states that the WSDOT Northwest Region Current Practices in Electrical Design applies to this location.
5	2.17.3	Will any master controllers be required for the interconnected signal systems?	9/29/2014	Yes. WSDOT will prepare an addendum to address this issue.
6	2.17.3; page 2.17-4, lines 35-36	Can this provision be expanded to include mounting of APS pushbuttons and ped heads on Type 1 signal standards?	9/29/2014	Yes. WSDOT will prepare an addendum to address this issue.
7	2.17.3.9; page 2.17-7, line 1	Does this preclude the use of flashing yellow arrow (all arrow heads)?	9/29/2014	Yes. All arrow displays for left turn signals shall be used for protected-only operations.
8	2.17.3.11; page 2.17-8, lines 14-15	Will speed studies also be required for Signal Systems #1 and #2? Olympic Region advance loop spacing based on 85th percentile speeds, not posted speed limit.	9/29/2014	Yes. A speed study is required to determine the 85th percentile speeds.
9	Appendix T4; page 6, section 1.6.2.1	WSDOT NWR ITS Current Practices Supplement says existing ITS cabinets that are more than 10 years old must be replaced. We have identified several cabinets that are more than 10 years old that the IT Conceptual Plans do not show as being replaced. Will we be required to replace old cabinets that are not shown as being replaced on the IT Conceptual Plans? Also, please clarify when the 10 year period ends – is it the Notice to Proceed for this project?	9/29/2014	See Addendum 4.
10	Contract Form, Exhibit A	Does the Contract Form Exhibit A, Project Description South Project Limit - SR 167 MP 10.48 and North Project Limit - SR 167 MP 18.24 and the east/west definition define the limits of works for the new improvements of Signing? If yes does signing need to be potentially replaced within these boundaries if older than 5 years?	10/2/2014	No. Section 2.19.1 will be revised in a future addendum to clarify limits. Section 2.19.1 also states "The Design Builder shall be responsible for providing all new signing required for changes made to the roadway geometry or lane configuration".
11	Contract Form, Exhibit A	Does the Contract Form Exhibit A, Project Description South Project Limit - SR 167 MP 10.48 and North Project Limit - SR 167 MP 18.24 and the east/west definition define the limits of works for the new improvements of Roadway? Or does the Pedestrian Facilities Improvement Line Control?	10/2/2014	The Contract Form Exhibit A defines the Project limits. The limits of specific Work involved in this Project are further defined in Chapter 2 of the RFP. The limits of Work for the pedestrian facilities improvements are delineated on the Conceptual Plans as defined in Section 2.11.3.10.1.

KEY:
Closed:
New:

SR 167 / 8th St E Vic to S 277th St Vic - Southbound HOT Lane Project
RFP Questions and Answers #3 - October 28, 2014

Question	RFP Reference	Question	Date Received	Response
12	Contract Form, Exhibit A	Does the Contract Form Exhibit A, Project Description South Project Limit - SR 167 MP 10.48 and North Project Limit - SR 167 MP 18.24 and the east/west definition define the limits of works for the new improvements of drainage? If yes, does drainage need to be evaluated for the existing conditions for this boundary and potential new improvements?	10/2/2014	The Contract Form Exhibit A defines the Project limits. The Project specifics are further defined in Chapter 2 of the RFP. Follow the requirements in Section 2.14 for Stormwater Management.
13	Contract Form, Exhibit A	Does the Contract Form Exhibit A, Project Description South Project Limit - SR 167 MP 10.48 and North Project Limit - SR 167 MP 18.24 and the east/west definition define the limits of works for the new improvements of ITS/Tolling? If yes, does ITS/Tolling need to be evaluated for the existing equipment for this boundary and potential new improvements?	10/2/2014	The Contract Form Exhibit A defines the Project limits. The limits of specific Work involved in this Project are further defined in Chapter 2 of the RFP. Follow the requirements in Section 2.18 for ITS and Section 2.26 for Tolling.
14		The RFP documents would require ramp lighting prior to SR 167 MP 10.48 (Begin Project). Are those luminaires required or omitted from the design if outside of project bounds?	10/2/2014	The 8th St E to SR 167 southbound on-ramp will remain as-is and this on-ramp is located outside of the Project limits. Therefore, the Design-Builder is required to provide ramp lighting up to the gore area (see Design Manual Exhibit 1040-3, July 2014).
15	Appendix T4; Sections 2.2.2 and 2.2.3	Appendix T4 Sections 2.2.2 and 2.2.3 require that a “screened, 2-inch drain pipe” be installed between cable vaults and pull boxes and any drainage ditch, swale or pond within 100 feet. Please clarify whether this requirement only applies when the cable vault/pull box and drainage ditch, swale or pond are on the same side of the road or is it intended to apply even when they are on the opposite sides of the road. Does is apply to CAVBS or Media Filter Drains?	10/2/2014	This will apply regardless of which side the cable vault or pull box needs to drain to. Yes, the vault may drain to a media filter drain, a CABS, or a CAVFS.
16	2.18.4.10	RFP Section 2.18.4.10 requires new communications equipment provided in all ITS cabinets. Please confirm that this is required for all existing ITS cabinets, and not just new, within the project limits.	10/2/2014	This is required for both existing and new ITS cabinets. All existing ITS communication equipment in existing ITS cabinets within project limits shall be upgraded per Appendix T4. It also notes that "existing and new ITS devices shall be connected to the new single mode fiber optic system."
17	Appendices M1 and T4	The conceptual drawings indicate the following existing ITS cabinets and equipment to remain. However, they appear to be older than 10 years from the Notice to Proceed date (per as-builts provided). Please confirm the age of these devices and replacement requirements per the Appendix T4 Section 1.6.2 that will apply. a. 167vc01580 b. 167es01586 c. 167es01628 d. 167es01687 e. 167es01738 f. 167es01784 g. 167vc01796 h. 167es01799 i. Auburn FTC at STA LM 527+50	10/2/2014	This portion of Conceptual Plans is reference. The DB is required to meet all design and construction contract requirements in accordance with the RFP and Mandatory Standards. Also, Per General Provision 1-02.4, WSDOT recommends performing a field review to verify information. Please let us know if you would like to arrange a field visit with WSDOT ITS Maintenance.
18	2.16.3.4.6 and Appendix M1	There are several pull boxes/cable vaults in the median between STA LM’ 683+50 and 726+00 shown as existing to remain. Are these cable vaults and pull boxes standard duty and, therefore, need to be upgraded to the heavy duty standard per RFP Section 2.16.3.4.6? Are as-builts available to confirm?	10/2/2014	This portion of the Conceptual Plans is reference. The DB is required to meet all design and construction requirements in accordance with the RFP and Mandatory Standards. Per General Provision 1-04.1, "The Design-Builder's reliance on any aspect of the Conceptual Design other than the Basic Configuration shall be at its own risk." Also, Per General Provision 1-02.4, WSDOT recommends performing a field review to verify information. Please let us know if you would like to arrange a field visit with WSDOT ITS Maintenance.

KEY:
Closed:
New:

SR 167 / 8th St E Vic to S 277th St Vic - Southbound HOT Lane Project
RFP Questions and Answers #3 - October 28, 2014

Question	RFP Reference	Question	Date Received	Response
19	2.18.5.1, Appendices M1 and T4	The conceptual drawings do not appear to indicate new maintenance pullouts and access roads at cabinets and ITS devices as required by the RFP Section 2.18.5.2, and Appendix T4 Sections 1.7. Please confirm that these are necessary for all proposed and existing cabinets, CCTV camera installations, HAR transmitter (maintenance access road), and Environmental Sensor Station (maintenance access road).	10/2/2014	The pullouts and access roads shown in the Conceptual Plans are reference elements. The Conceptual Plans do not show all contractually required maintenance pullouts and access roads. Contractually required maintenance pullouts and access roads are necessary.
20	2.16.3.3.4	Design areas for illumination have recently been reduced and the lighting analysis allows a reduction in the number of luminaires required to adequately light the required design areas. Reviewing the calculation results revealed areas where the number of luminaires can be reduced such as city streets adjacent to ramp terminal intersections and on interchange ramps where additional or redundant lighting may be beneficial if left in place and changed to LED heads (where applicable). In cases such as these where Engineering judgment may lead to some redundancy we have the following question – Does WSDOT prefer to remove existing light standards and luminaires that are no longer needed to properly illuminate required design areas, leave as is, or replace luminaires with LED where applicable? See attached examples to illustrate question.	10/6/2014	This will be addressed by addendum.
21	2.18.4.4	Section 2.18.4.4 mentions that "At interchanges, camera shall be located to provide a full view of the intersecting arterial and ramps, and all pavement surfaces within the limited access and within the Project limits shall be completely visible by CCTV." Section 2.18.4.4 also mentions that "no trees shall be removed to obtain the required visibility for new or existing cameras". The existing and proposed cameras shown on the conceptual ITS drawings do not appear to provide adequate coverage for all the ramps with respect to the foliage at the SR 18 interchange and the project's lateral limits defined by Contract Forms and Appendix Q2. Confirm that additional camera(s) are required.	10/8/2014	The camera locations on the Conceptual Plans are reference. The DB is required to meet all contract requirements.
22	Appendices M1, N1, and T4	Per the concept drawings and as-built drawings, the following on- and off-ramps appear to be missing existing merge loops (per T4 3.2.3.14.6) and off-ramp loops (per T4 3.2.3.12) at the following locations: a. 15th St SW – NB off-ramp to SR 18 loop b. 15th St NW – SB on-ramp merge loop c. 15th St NW – NB off-ramp loop d. 15th St NW – NB on-ramp merge loop e. S 277th St – SB on-ramp merge loop f. S 277th St – NB on-ramp merge loop Please clarify, are new loops and conduit system required for these locations?	10/8/2014	The merge loops on the Conceptual Plans are reference elements. The DB is required to meet all contract requirements. In accordance with Section 2.18.4.2.1 of the RFP, "All lanes, ramps, and special use facilities within the Project limits shall have fully functioning induction loop detectors upon Physical Completion."
23	Appendix T4, Section 3.1.2.7	The distance between existing cameras at 167vc01477 and 167vc01580 appear to exceed the Appendix T4 Section 3.1.2.7 maximum spacing requirement of 4500'. The conceptual plans do not indicate a new camera between these two existing installations. Please confirm that the maximum spacing requirement applies to these two existing camera installations.	10/8/2014	The camera locations on the Conceptual Plans are reference elements. The DB is required to meet all contract requirements. In accordance with Section 2.18.4.4 of the RFP, "All pavement surfaces within the limited access and within the Project limits shall be completely visible by CCTV cameras." Section 3.1.2.1 of ITS Current Practices Supplement states, "Camera shall provide 100% coverage of all freeway lanes and ramps."

KEY:
Closed:
New:

SR 167 / 8th St E Vic to S 277th St Vic - Southbound HOT Lane Project
RFP Questions and Answers #3 - October 28, 2014

Question	RFP Reference	Question	Date Received	Response
24	Appendices M1 and T4	The conceptual plans do not indicate a CCTV camera within 2000' of the existing TRS 167rs01660. Please confirm that the 2000' requirement in Appendix T4 Section 3.1.2.2.2 applies for existing TRS signs.	10/8/2014	Yes, it applies to both existing and new TRS signs.
25	Appendix T4, Section 1.6.2.1	Appendix T4 Section 1.6.2.1 specifies that cabinets older than 10 years (as of the NTP date) need to be replaced. Please confirm that this 10 year requirement applies to electrical service and transformer cabinets as well.	10/8/2014	No. This 10 year requirement in the NWR ITS Current Practices Supplement applies to ITS cabinets only and does not apply to electrical service or transformer cabinets.
26	Appendix T4, Section 3.2.3.16	Appendix T4 Section 3.2.3.16 specifies the maximum detector lead-ins and stop bar loops (demand and passage) at metered ramps as 500ft. It also specifies the maximum detector lead-in for all other loops at metered ramps as 800ft. The conceptual plans indicates lead-in length that exceed this requirement for the following locations: a. 8th St E – SB on-ramp merge loop and NB mainline loops. b. 8th St E – NB on-ramp merge loop and SB mainline loops. c. Ellingson Rd – SB on-ramp merge loop and all mainline loops. d. Ellingson Rd – NB on-ramp merge loop and SB mainline loops. e. 15th St SW – SB on-ramp merge loop and NB mainline loops. Confirm that the detector lead-ins maximum length requirements apply for these locations.	10/8/2014	Appendix T4 is a contract document, and the lengths shown on the Conceptual Plans are reference. Yes, the requirement applies for all locations listed.
27	2.26.3.6.3	Section 2.26.3.6.3 requires the DB to "write, provide and install" all software and any needed hardware to ensure the electronic displays are fully compatible with and completely capable of being operated by WSDOT's existing computer system, while requiring no additional software or software modifications." Writing software would appear to constitute additional software or software modifications. Please clarify the intent of this requirement and whether software development is within the scope of this project for the DB.	10/8/2014	The Design-Builder needs to provide all software loaded on to the TRS. This software shall not require modifying WSDOT existing computer systems or require any additional software.
28	1-07.18(5)	Section 1-07.18(5) of the General Provisions states that "The Design-Builder shall be responsible for reporting and processing insurance claims relating to Differing Site Conditions." Who holds and pays the premiums for this insurance policy?	10/9/2014	In the event a Differing Site Condition may be a "potentially covered claim" under an insurance policy required under Section 1-07.18 of the General Provisions, then it is the DB who is responsible for pursuing that claim. The Design-Builder holds and pays the premiums for that insurance policy.
29	1-07.18(2)	Section 1-07.18(2) states that the contractor must hold a General Insurance policy with a deductible not exceeding $500,000. This policy will increase labor costs by approximately 11%. Since the deductible is the sole responsibility of the contractor, we ask that the maximum limits of the deductible be removed in order to reduce cost to the project?	10/9/2014	No change will be made to the requirements.
30	1-07.18(1).2	Section 1-7.18(1).2 requires that the general liability policy include coverage for the liability arising out of the acts, errors, and omissions in the rendering or failure to render professional services under the Contract Documents or in the performance of the Work. Can the contractor provide the liability coverage for professional services under a separate policy? If not, is the CG 2279 endorsement to the general liability policy acceptable to WSDOT?	10/9/2014	In order for the CGL policy to comply with the contract requirements, it must (i) contain no restrictions whatsoever concerning professional liability, or (ii) be endorsed with CG 2280 0798, which is a form of endorsement which is readily available.
31	1-07.18(2).2	Section 1-7.18(2).2 requires the Contractor to provide certified copies of all insurance policies at least 10 days prior to Contract execution. Some of the policies may not be issued immediately after notice of intent to award and actual policies may take up to 90 days or more to obtain. Could this requirement be amend to indicate that certifications of insurance will be provided within 10 day window, not certified policy copies?	10/9/2014	This requirement was amended by Addendum No. 2.

KEY:
Closed:
New:

SR 167 / 8th St E Vic to S 277th St Vic - Southbound HOT Lane Project
RFP Questions and Answers #3 - October 28, 2014

<table>
<tr><th>Question</th><th>RFP Reference</th><th>Question</th><th>Date Received</th><th>Response</th></tr>
<tr><td>32</td><td>2.8.4.4</td><td>Section 2.8.4.4, FUGITIVE DUST CONTROL, states that Fugitive dust shall be controlled by the Design-Builder in accordance with the Memorandum of Agreement between WSDOT and Puget Sound Clean Air Agency Regarding Control of Fugitive Dust from Construction Projects. This memorandum is not included in appendix E, please provide this memorandum?</td><td>10/9/2014</td><td>No. Section 2.8.4.4 will be revised in a future addendum.</td></tr>
<tr><td>33</td><td>2.27.5.2</td><td>RFP Section 2.27.5.2 Floodplain Storage Mitigation Site (Site C) states the sizing of Site C shall be based on mitigating 9.70 acres of new impervious area that includes 7.71 acres constructed as part of the Work plus 1.99 acres that will be added in the future SR 167 Stage 5 project. The Design-Builder shall design and construct the facility according to the following specifications:
• Verify that the final design meets the permitted flow control performance criteria for both the as-built condition (Stage 4 alone) and the future (As-Built Stage 4 plus future Stage 5) condition. Please define “permitted flow control performance criteria”?
• No increase in the downstream Mill Creek peak flow rates for the developed peak flows from 50% of the 2-yr up to the 50-yr recurrent storm events based on the HSPF continuous hydrologic model. There is no mention of duration analysis in the RFP. Does this mean that matching flow durations is not required?
• Storage volume added by Site C shall match or exceed the volume that the HSPF model predicts as direct runoff from the new impervious surfaces that Site C is intended to mitigate. Our review of the proposed HSP model shows site C is capable of mitigating approximately 8.5 acres of impervious area and the RFP requires the Design-Builder to mitigate for 9.7 acres of impervious area. Please provide documentation of how the 9.7 acres was allocated in the site C HSPF Model?
• Flow velocities in Mill Creek shall be less than 3 feet per second for the 100-year design frequencies based on a HES-RAS hydraulic model. Where is the Mill Creek point of compliance for flow control?
• The flow frequency results provided with Appendix H.3 HSPF files (summarized in table below) include results at 4 compliance points downstream of site C. Compliance points 22 and 19 are the only two that are in compliance with the RFP. Does this mean an increase in peak flows is allowed between points 24b and 22?

<table><tr><th colspan="2">Compliance Point</th><th>Summary of Appendix H.3 Frequency Analysis (February).xls</th></tr><tr><td>24b</td><td>D/S of Site C</td><td>Peak flow increases at 10-yr storm and above.
No increase in peak flow at 2-yr and 5-yr.</td></tr><tr><td>22</td><td>D/S of 167</td><td>No increase in peak flow at all reported events (2-yr through 100-yr)</td></tr><tr><td>20</td><td>¼ mi. D/S</td><td>Peak flow increases at 5-yr storm only.
No increase in peak flow at all other events.</td></tr><tr><td>19</td><td>U/S of Green R.</td><td>No increase in peak flow at all reported events (2-yr through 100-yr)</td></tr></table></td><td>10/9/2014</td><td>(1)The modeling that was used to obtain the permits used developed peak flows from 50% of the 2-yr up to the 50-yr recurrent storm events based on the HSPF continuous hydrologic model. The agencies accepted that and mandated that Site C have the same performance as submitted for the permits. This performance is the "permitted flow control performance criteria".

(2) Yes. Matching flow durations is not required.

(3)Appendix H3 provides the HSPF model that includes PERLIN and IMPLND values that document how the new impervious area was allocated by basin. The Design-Builder shall not change those PERLIN and IMPLND values in the assessment of compliance with the permitted (Future Stage 4 plus 5) condition. We recognize that a basin map is needed to do the modeling for the as-built post-project condition model deliverables. This map will be provided to the successful Proposer.

(4) The following bullet point defines the 4 compliance points that were used for agency approval. Those same points will be used to verify that the as-built performance matches the permitted design.

(5) The permits document that the performance as reported was accepted by the agencies. If the as-built condition meets the permitted design performance, WSDOT will accept the design as being compliant with the permit.</td></tr>
<tr><td>34</td><td></td><td>While the RFP requires that the bottoms of site C be designed with a gradient slope, the design approved after extensive consultation with the Department of Ecology, the Department of Fish and Wildlife, the Mukleshoot Indian Nation and the US Army Corps of Engineers does not provide this gradient, and will not be readily changed. Can this requirement by eliminated?</td><td>10/9/2014</td><td>No. See future addendum for modfication to requirements for Site C.</td></tr>
</table>

KEY:
Closed:
New:

SR 167 / 8th St E Vic to S 277th St Vic - Southbound HOT Lane Project
RFP Questions and Answers #3 - October 28, 2014

Question	RFP Reference	Question	Date Received	Response
35	Appendix T4	The maximum longitudinal distance between two consecutive existing cameras in the SR167 project corridor exceeds 4500 feet. Is the Design Builder required to provide an additional camera, pole and foundation to satisfy the requirements of WSDOT NWR ITS Current Practices Supplement 3.1.2.7?	10/9/2014	Appendix T4 is Contract Document and shall be followed.
36		Could WSDOT provide information regarding existing CCTV blind spots to help the Design-Builder with quantifying additional cameras?	10/9/2014	No. You may visit Dayton TMC and use the cameras to look for blind spots. Please contact the WSDOT Representative to arrange a time.
37		If a new camera is installed on an existing camera pole, will the Design-Builder be required to widen the existing shoulder to a type 2 pullout if the existing pull out does not meet the requirement of type 2 pull out?	10/9/2014	Yes.
38	Appendix T4	Is it the intent of WSDOT to upgrade all the existing ITS communication equipment in the existing ITS cabinets within the project limits per Appendix T4, WSDOT NWR ITS Current Practices Supplement, Section 2.4.1?	10/9/2014	Yes.
39	Appendix T4	Could the Design-Builder be provided an existing ITS inventory, including model numbers, to determine if the existing ITS cabinets within the project limits need to be replaced with new cabinets per the requirements of Appendix T4, WSDOT NWR ITS Current Practices Supplement, section 1.6.2?	10/9/2014	No we don't have the information. The Proposer shall verify the information by opening existing cabinets. Coordinate with the WSDOT Representative identified in the ITP to arrange ITS maintenance personnel to accomodate the Proposer. The manufacturer's product information and testing date should be in the cabinets. The Proposer can also check the as-builts of previous projects.
40	2.18.4.8.1.5	RFP section 2.18.4.8.1.5 Patch Panel Components states new pre-terminated patch panels to be furnished and installed to replace the fiber distribution panels at the existing fiber terminal cabinet FTC-305 at approximately SR 167 STA LM' 528+00. Are all fiber distribution panels in the existing FTC to be replaced with new pre-terminated distribution panels? Please clarify what existing fiber cables are terminated in the FTC?	10/9/2014	Yes. All fiber distribution panels in the existing FTC shall be replaced with new pre-terminated distribution panels. There are two cables (mainline and distribution) going each direction N,S, E,W.
41	Addendum 4	Per Addendum 4, the Design-Builder is required to install new fiber between STA LM'465 and 625+90. Is the Design-Builder required to pull the new mainline and distribution fiber cables to the existing fiber terminal cabinet FTC-305 and splice them to the pre-terminated pigtails?	10/9/2014	Yes.
42	2.18.4.8.1.5	RFP section 2.18.4.8.1.5 Patch Panel Components requires new pre-terminated patch panels to replace the fiber distribution panels at all ITS, TRS, and roadside toll cabinets within the Project limits. Based on the WSDOT naming convention of the CCTV camera, CCTV 018vc00286, the camera is not part of the fiber optic cables installed on SR167 but rather SR18. If the Design-Builder is required to install a new pre-terminated patch panel in the existing CCTV camera cabinet, and this pre-terminated patch panel is spliced to SR18 fiber, is additional fiber testing required of the SR18 fiber cable system and is there additional equipment that needs to be installed at another hub?	10/9/2014	No. Even though the CCTV is named 018vc00286, it is part of the SR 167 fiber optic cables, not the SR18 cables.

KEY:
Closed:
New:

SR 167 / 8th St E Vic to S 277th St Vic - Southbound HOT Lane Project
RFP Questions and Answers #3 - October 28, 2014

Question	RFP Reference	Question	Date Received	Response
43	Appendix D8	The WSDOT Geotechnical Design Manual (GDM) Section 6.5.4.2 allows a Force-Based Approach to estimate the lateral spread / flow failure load on deep foundations. The current (December 2013) GDM provides an empirical method ("the Japanese Force Method") for this estimate based on back-calculations from pile foundation failures caused by lateral spreading. The previous version of the GDM (January 2010) provided the Japanese Force Method, as well as a method based on limit equilibrium analysis. For the estimation of lateral spread / flow failure loads on proposed deep foundations at the north and south abutments of Bridge 167/112W, is the use of a limit equilibrium approach as described in the January 2010 GDM acceptable to WSDOT?	10/9/2014	No. The limit equilibrium method was removed as an acceptable method to estimate flow failure loads prior to the December 2013 version of the GDM that is required in the RFP, so it is not considered to be an acceptable method to estimate flow failure loads for the bridges on this Project.
44		The asphalt tapers for bridge 167-112W are in conflict with 6 each existing mast light foundations. The RFP requires the bridge to be at least 10' away from the existing SB SR-167 Bridge for maintenance reasons. Could this requirement be modified so that the new bridge could be moved closer to the existing SB SR-167 Bridge to eliminate the removal and temporary relocation of the conflicting mast lights?	10/9/2014	No.
45	2.13.4.2.1.1	Section 2.13.4.2.1.1 requires a Pushover analysis to determine the capacity to demand ratios for the existing and modified structure and determination of displacement capacities for the existing and modified structures. Based on this analysis, this section requires that the design and construction of a retrofit is required to modify the structure to meet or exceed the existing structure C/D Ratio. Based on previous experience, the results of the Pushover analysis could show a significant increase of the column's overstrength plastic moment capacity at the connections to the superstructure of the bridge when the required column jackets are added to bridge columns. If the Pushover analysis results confirm this scenario, the design and construction scope associated with the retrofit of this bridge will significantly increase. Given that the seismic upgrade of this bridge was originally going to be included in a design bid build project, can WSDOT provide any preliminary analysis for this bridge confirming that the required column jackets is all that is required to seismically upgrade this bridge or confirm that no work outside of the column jacketing will be required? If the Pushover analysis indicates additional work to the superstructure is necessary; can this additional scope of work be compensated as Force Account under Standard Specification 1-09.6.	10/9/2014	WSDOT will adjust the compensation for this work by addendum.
46	Appendix S	Appendix S provides a conceptual bridge plan, with a pier in the median of SR 18. The existing median, between the shoulders, is 5.5 feet wide. The existing SR 18 EB shoulder is 2.4 feet wide, and the existing SR 18 WB shoulder is 5.2 feet wide. The installation of this median pier will require removing the SR 18 pavement. We have two questions. 1) If an existing condition on SR 18 (lane width, shoulder width, cross slope, etc.) does not meet current full standards, and it has to be removed and replaced due to the pier installation, does it need to be evaluated and upgraded to meet full standards? Will a design deviation be needed to match existing conditions? Is obtaining the design deviation the design builder's responsibility? 2) Will the design builder be allowed to further reduce the existing SR 18 shoulder widths in order to fit a column with concrete barriers in the median? Or will multiple 3-foot columns be required in the median so that the existing shoulders are not reduced?	10/10/2014	1) If the shoulders remain as they exist then see DM Section 1140.09 page 1140-9 "At existing bridge piers and abutments, a shoulder less than full width to a minimum of 2 feet is a design exception." If shoulders are narrowed from the existing condition, a deviation will be required. 2) No. Not without an ATC that includes an approved deviation.

KEY:
Closed:
New:

SR 167 / 8th St E Vic to S 277th St Vic - Southbound HOT Lane Project
RFP Questions and Answers #3 - October 28, 2014

Question	RFP Reference	Question	Date Received	Response
47	Appendix G	Regarding bridge foundations, the GBR states "artesian groundwater is present that will also affect the construction of drilled shafts." And one of the baseline assumptions that shall be used for the bridge foundations is "artesian groundwater conditions with a pressure head up to 25 feet above the current ground surface will be encountered anywhere below a depth of 60 feet, as measured from the current ground surface elevation, in all shaft excavations performed within a radial distance of 10 feet of the center point of the foundation locations identified in the Conceptual Plans." The explorations provided in the GDR at the SR 167 Bridge overcrossing SR 18 did not appear to indicate artesian conditions are present, and WSDOT's evaluations provided in Appendices G4 and G8 for the SR 18 overcrossing did not indicate significant artesian conditions exist at depth or follow the ground surface. What subsurface data are these baseline statements/assumptions based on?	10/14/2014	The baseline assumption is based on vibrating wire piezometer data collected in boring H-17vwp-13 with pressures slightly above the existing ground surface, and the artesian head of over 9 feet measured in boring P-2p-13 at the time of drilling when the drillers reached the final depth of the boring. The artesian in boring P-2p-13 was likely even higher because the head of 9 feet was measured by stacking up sections of casing to a height of 9 feet and the water was still overflowing the casing at that height. Additionally, there may be documentation in some of the reference documents included in Appendix G06.
48	2.7.3.2.5	RFP Section 2.7.3.2.5 includes planing and HMA overlay for 8th Street E (B Line). Limits are not provided for this work. Can a station range be provided for the planing and HMA overlay work?	10/15/2014	Yes. Limits will be provided in an addendum.
49	2.19.3.3.18	RFP Section 2.19.3.3.18 states the Conceptual Guide Sign Plan is included in the Conceptual Plans, and that this "plan identifies the approximate location of mainline guide signs and well as HAR signs, MIS, TRS, HOT Lane signs, other overhead signs, and multi-post regulatory, warning and information signs." Does that mean all signs of the types listed are included, and the Conceptual Signing Plan can be relied upon to be complete for these types of signs?	10/15/2014	The signing sheets within Conceptual Plans are reference except where the Technical Requirements specify otherwise.
50		Are there sufficient closures on SR 18 to allow the Design Builder to construct the owners concept for the southbound SR 167 Bridge over SR 18?	10/15/2014	No. See Addendum 7.
51		The southbound bridge over 8th Street E is at station 327+00, and is within the project limits. No work is shown on this bridge, and there is no restriping. The inside shoulder is 6.5' wide. There is no design deviation for this shoulder to remain 6.5' wide. Does a design deviation need to be obtained to leave this shoulder in place? Or, since there is no alignment or striping change from existing, can it remain at 6.5' wide without a deviation?	10/15/2014	The 6.5' shoulder meets WSDOT Design Manual guidelines. See DM Exhibit 1140-6.
52	2.13.4.2.13	Section 2.13.4.2.13 requires bridge barriers to be 32" F-Shape. Addendum 6 Appendix D02, Bridge Design Memo 08-2014 "Bridge Traffic Barrier Design Requirements for Fall Protection" requires 42" barrier. Which bridge barrier height is required? Also, if 42" barrier is required, which shape is required- single slope or F-shape? If 32" barrier is required, is metal railing required on top?	10/17/2014	See Addendum 8.
53	2.8.5.3	RFP Section 2.8.5.3 states that "Unless otherwise indicated in the Contract, work shall not occur outside of the Impact Area Line except for landscaping and ROW fence repair." Appendix P1 includes the JARPA that illustrates permanent and temporary impacts. It appears that the Impact Area Line provided in the conceptual plans and Microstation files, is the temporary impact line. Can the permanent impact line, as shown in the JARPA, be provided in Microstation format? It appears that no fill or excavation can be placed within the temporary impact area, and grading activities are limited to the permanent impact line as shown in the JARPA, please confirm.	10/17/2014	See Addendum 8.

KEY:
Closed:
New:

SR 167 / 8th St E Vic to S 277th St Vic - Southbound HOT Lane Project
RFP Questions and Answers #3 - October 28, 2014

Question	RFP Reference	Question	Date Received	Response
54	2.1.1.4	RFP Section 2.1.1.4 includes the Project Description, with specific elements of work. RFP Section 2.11.3.1, bullet two states that the Project shall be designed to meet the full design level. We have the following questions regarding full evaluation: 1) Are portions of ramps, side streets, and mainline that are within the Project Limits, but have no work (no paving or striping) required to be evaluated for full design level for all items listed in the matrix? 2) If a portion of a ramp, side street or mainline that is not included in the project work, but is required to be temporarily re-striped for MOT purposes, and then re-striped back to existing conditions, required to be evaluated for full design level, for all items listed in the matrix? 3) For the portion of southbound mainline that is shown to be re-striped only to revise the HOT lane width, do all items listed in the matrix need to be evaluated, even if they are not being reconstructed (barrier heights, cross slope and superelevation, cut/fill slopes, etc.)? 4) For the portion of northbound mainline, where the only work shown is the median barrier reconstruction, do all items listed in the matrix need to be evaluated, or only items that could be affected by the new median barrier (ie. do we evaluate cross slope, lane and shoulder width, cut/fill slopes, etc. or only horizontal sight distance since the new barrier is a different height from existing)? 5) If the above areas do require full evaluation, and the existing condition does not meet standards, and no work is shown or listed in the RFP for that upgrade (ie widening, regrading side slopes, correcting cross slopes, replacing barrier, etc.), will a design deviation be approved to leave the existing condition as is?	10/17/2014	1) No. The Design-Builder is only required to evaluate at those locations where construction of the permanent Work impacts the existing roadway or roadside designs. Evaluation shall include connection/transition to the existing roadway and roadway features. 2) No. The restriping Work associated with MOT is not considered as the permanent Work. 3) Yes. Design Matrix 3 line 8 applies to the southbound SR 167 within the project limits. 4) The Design-Builder shall evaluate all items listed in the design matrix where the median barrier will be placed. 5) Yes, if the design deviation is not related to the construction of permanent Work.
55	2.14.4.8	Chapter 2.14.4.8 requires the design builder to perform a downstream analysis if any existing stormwater facilities are impacted or modified by the Project. In the Mill basin we are not providing flow control at the source, rather providing flow control to mitigate downstream flooding in Mill Creek (Site C). There are multiple discharge locations within the Mill Creek Basin that will have increased flows post project due to the increased impervious area added along the corridor. Some of these existing conveyance systems many not have capacity to accommodate the increased runoff. No impacts to the wetlands were provided in the JARPA to replace the culverts or re-grade the ditches. We have the following questions: 1) Do we need to construct a new conveyance system to avoid impacts to these wetlands, if they cannot handle the added flows?	10/17/2014	Yes.
56	2.1.4.2.2	As we understand from the open house, the WSDOT-Owned Property located at as 1422 Raymond Ave. SW Renton, WA 98057 was vandalized and the major impacts were to the electrical and plumbing systems. If the Design-Builder chooses to use this property, is the Design-Builder responsible for the repair of the electrical and plumbing systems and any other damages due to the vandalism?	10/20/2014	Yes. See Appendix R5.
57	2.16.3.4.6	RFP Section 2.16.3.4.6 requires that “existing junction boxes, cable vaults, or pull boxes located in the paved shoulder that do not meet the current Heavy Duty design standard shall be replaced with boxes that meet the current Heavy Duty design standard”. Would replacing the pull box or cable vault lid be sufficient to retrofit the existing box to the Heavy Duty design standard or is an entire box replacement necessary?	10/22/2014	Both the box and the lid shall meet the Heavy Duty design standards.

KEY:
Closed:
New:

SR 167 / 8th St E Vic to S 277th St Vic - Southbound HOT Lane Project
RFP Questions and Answers #3 - October 28, 2014

Question	RFP Reference	Question	Date Received	Response
58	Appendix T4	Appendix T4 Section 2.4.1.1 indicates that each ITS cabinet shall include a RS900 or RS900G (for CCTV camera cabinets) network switch. Where ITS cabinets are co-located on a shared foundation, would it be acceptable to provide a single network switch housed in one cabinet that can be shared amongst the other co-located ITS cabinets or is a RS900 switch required in each cabinet?	10/22/2014	No. An RS900 or RS900G network switch is required in each ITS cabinet as indicated in Section 2.4.1.1 of the WSDOT NWR ITS Current Practices Supplement (Appendix T4).
59	2.16.3.4.2	Section 2.16.3.4.2., lines 9-10, require main breaker sizes to be minimum 100 amps for electrical services in Pierce County and 200 amps for all other services. Can modified service cabinets be installed with main breakers exceeding 200 amps? If so, what main breaker ratings above 200 amps would be acceptable?	10/23/2014	No. Main breaker size shall not exceed the sizes indicated in the RFP. There is an exception to the main breaker size of services installed in Pierce County supplying power to ITS equipment. These services shall have breaker sizes of 200 amps.
60	2.16.3.4.2	Section 2.16.3.4.2: Where additional loads on existing electrical services will exceed the existing main breaker rating, can the main breaker and possibly feeder conductors be upsized within the limits of the service busswork to address the revised loads?	10/23/2014	No. The service should be replaced or an additional service shall be installed.
61	2.16.3.3.4	Section 2.16.3.3.4, page 2.16-6, lines 4-11, require LED ramp meter illumination on the S 277th St. northbound on-ramp. Relocations of existing light standards are allowed to achieve required lighting levels, uniformity and veiling luminance with the LED luminaires. Two of the existing light standards on this on-ramp are located on a retaining wall with elbow mounts. Preliminary illumination calculations show that one of these wall-mounted light standards can remain in its current location, but the other must move about 100' to another location on the wall. The wall demo, new elbow mount foundation, junction boxes, conduit work and rebuilding the wall is a substantial effort. Will WSDOT require whatever wall modifications are necessary to obtain illumination requirements or will they accept LED luminaire replacements at the existing wall-mounted light standard locations that will result in substandard illumination?	10/23/2014	The Design-Builder shall provide the required lighting requirements. The Design-Builder shall submit the proposed modification design for Review and Comment.
62	Appendix M1	The proposed concept shows a new sign bridge spanning SB SR167 at station LM' 690+00. Two signs are to be placed on the sign bridge with one being a Good2Go sign placed over the HOT/HOV lane and the other being a guide sign for NW 15th St. At this location there is an existing median barrier with 10 foot shoulders on both northbound and southbound SR167. Adding a barrier mounted sign bridge would reduce both shoulders and would no longer meet full standards. There is currently no shoulder deviation for this area of the project. Is it WSDOT's intent to obtain a shoulder deviation for this new sign bridge or would their direction be to widen this area of southbound SR167 to the west and adjust the striping to meet full standard shoulder width?	10/23/2014	The contract requires the Design-Builder to meet design manual standards. If the sign structure needs to be moved to meet the standards, then it should be moved. If the sign structure cannot be moved and a deviation is required, WSDOT will obtain that deviation for the Design-Builder.
63	2.16.3.3.4	Please clarify the language "Modify the high mast lighting system…" in Section 2.16.3.3.4 Specific Requirements, Page 2.16-6, Lines 22-24 of Addendum 3. Are we required to replace existing high-mast lights with new lighting, even if our design does not warrant it?	10/23/2014	Modifying the existing high mast lighting system means moving and replacing those components of the high mast lighting system only if they are in conflict with the roadway widening work. This may require replacing one or more high mast lighting standards as well as associated conduit, wiring and junction boxes.